

STAT

A1140

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 8, 1967

the independent oil man and our critical balance of payments would be further jeopardized by these additional imports of crude.

The mandatory import quota is based on national security. To use this program to deter a product price would seem to be playing right into the hands of the large international oil companies who are importing crude oil into the United States. Most all of these companies have just come out with financial statements indicating even higher net profits.

The independent oil producer has had increased cost of operation and increased cost of labor with only a slight token of increased price for his product. It is necessary that the independent survive to discover the needed reserve of crude oil which is so important to our national security.

Over the years the increased importation of crude oil has hurt the oil industry, especially here in Oklahoma. We vigorously oppose any further increased import of crude oil and/or refined products from petrochemical plants whose source of supply is from foreign crude.

Very truly yours,

T. P. MCADAMS, Jr.,
President.

FEBRUARY 22, 1967.

Mr. CHARLES F. LUCE,
*Under Secretary of the Interior, Department
of the Interior, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: This letter is to protest your activities and public statements with regard to your attempts to get the major oil companies to rescind their recent 1¢ per gallon price increases. Your public statements are ill-founded, and if your efforts are successful because of your threats to increase imports or shift purchases from domestic refiners to foreign refiners, the results will be disastrous for the small, independent oil man, while, at the same time, you will not be particularly affecting the companies who increased the price of gasoline.

In the first instance, the importers of crude oil are, for the most part, the major oil companies who are the refiners and retailers of gasoline. Increasing imports will not affect them but will have a direct and most detrimental effect on the small, independent oil producer, such as myself.

In the second instance, if you shift purchases of the Defense Department from domestic producers over to foreign producers, you will increase the drain on our already-depleted gold reserves, and again, for the most part, the benefactors of this shift in purchasing will be the same oil companies who are the domestic refiners and retailers. And, it is the small, independent producer such as myself who will feel the immediate effect of this shift because domestic demand for crude oil will be down, but in the long run our whole nation will suffer because of the drain on our gold reserves and the further lessening of incentives to develop domestic reserves of oil and gas.

In my opinion, it is utterly shameful that the oil industry must be harassed in this fashion. Our cost of doing business has increased tremendously over the years, and, at the same time, the price we receive for a barrel of crude oil is less today than ten years ago. My cost for 100' or 5½" casing for an oil well has gone from \$178.61 up to \$188.41 in the last 30 days. This is an increase of 5.4%. The new minimum wage law which went into effect February 1 increased my labor costs by 12%. The list could go on and on and on. The increase of 1¢ per gallon represents only 2.7% increase when calculated on the retail price a customer pays for a gallon of premium gas. Proportionately, the increase in price for a gallon of gasoline was far too small in order to keep pace with the increased cost of the oil of doing business.

In recent weeks we have seen some very modest increases in the prices that the crude

oil purchasers are paying for a barrel of crude oil. These increases have only partially restored reductions in the price paid for a barrel of crude oil. For the first time in my memory (except during the Suez crisis), the crude oil market has been stable, and the recent price increase of 1¢ per gallon for gasoline would have been a further stabilizing factor in that market. Now, it appears that for purely political reasons, you want to roll back prices, which is bad in itself, but the proposed method of doing it will further injure the one segment of our industry which should not be called on to suffer further detriment—the small, independent crude oil producer.

In summary, may I please request that you reconsider your proposed action. Specifically, may I request that you not increase imports or shift purchases from domestic to foreign purchases. Furthermore, your proposed increase in crude oil production by holders of federal leases again would benefit the major producers to the detriment of the small, independent producer.

Very truly yours,

JAMES L. PARKS.

The Powell Episode
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF NEW YORK

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1967

MR. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to another excellent editorial in the Albany Times-Union concerning the House's action in expelling Representative Adam Clayton Powell. The editorial properly points out the error in rejecting the select committee's bipartisan recommendation that Mr. Powell be disciplined. Secondly, the editorial stresses the need for a realistic and workable code of ethics, that, if delayed further, will have several adverse and undesirable effects.

The editorial follows:

THE POWELL EPISODE

Representative Adam Clayton Powell is down, but few will say he is out. Even his expulsion from the House of Representatives cannot be regarded as permanent, for he can be re-elected to his seat. If he chooses to attempt this, he will almost certainly succeed. Thus the Powell episode, with this and possibly more serious ramifications, is likely to be with us for some time.

This is only one of the reasons why in our opinion the House committed a grave error in its rejection of a select committee's bipartisan recommendation that Powell be censured, heavily fined, stripped of his seniority—but permitted to retain his congressional seat. The matter could conceivably have been laid to rest right there, with limited satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the part of both the "doves" and the "hawks" in the Powell issue.

Representative Powell's record in the Congress has been as paradoxical as his behavior has been brazen. He engineered far-reaching social legislation while raising eyebrows with flagrant abuse of his position of committee chairman. Certainly the House could neither condone nor ignore his conduct.

But it is observed that there may be others in the Congress who have done secretly what Powell did openly. For example, the possibility of certain disclosures of this nature by himself. What is certain, though, is that the entire Congress must now use the

Powell episode as an opportunity to undertake a universal self-examination and to deal with abuse of congressional privilege—overt or covert—with the same harshness that has been meted out to the congressman from New York. Anything else would be less than fair.

In Defense of the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF NEW YORK
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1967

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been too much irresponsible talk about the so-called CIA infiltration of foundations, labor unions, and other nongovernmental organizations. The fact is that CIA-aided groups have been instrumental in helping struggling democratic movements all over the world.

The following article from the March 2, 1967, edition of the New York World Journal Tribune, points out some of these instances. I commend the article to the attention of our colleagues:

DEFENSE OF THE CIA: SAVED LATIN UNION
(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—It is time that those of us who have been amongst the bursting plastic bombs, the gunfire and sabotage aimed at killing off burgeoning democratic regimes speak up loud and clear during this Central Intelligence Agency uproar.

This debate should not go by default to those who use as a podium the many universities peopled by so many students who have gone from the cradle to the gravy.

Certainly there are labor leaders who permitted their unions to be used as fronts. But why? And where?

There is the State, County and Municipal Employees Union which from 1958 to 1964 came to the rescue of a labor movement in British Guiana—a movement whose anti-Communist leaders were bombed, shot at, harassed and who were finally forced, after some deaths amongst their followers, to arm themselves.

The pro-Castro, pro-Stalin, pro-Maoist opposition was always well financed—and well trained. In the below sea level nation now Guyana, dikes were bombed. So were the telephone exchange, vital, irrigation viaducts and critical drainage systems from which a pestilence could have arisen to wipe out tens of thousands.

Defending the democratic faith was—and is—the slim, taut, fortyish Richard Ishmael, high school teacher and labor leader.

His car was shot at. He and his family were hounded. Why? Because he led the strategic non-Communist agriculture and electrical workers union called the Man-Power Citizens Assn.

The Mao-Castro operatives tried to smash his union, seize its manpower and contracts and so take over the land, as big as England itself. But despite the guns and bombs and death threats Ishmael and his colleague, now Prime Minister Forbes Burnham, prevailed. We helped them. If CIA was in on it—so what? So was British intelligence.

Central Intelligence went the foundation way in the Dominican Republic, too. I believe some unions were helped. Certainly, one of former President Juan Bosch's initiates was a conduit. Again, why not?

Let's not forget our former ambassador to Santo Domingo, John Bartlow Martin, what the Castro-Maoist forces dished out.